



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/687,174	10/15/2003	Jianfu Jeffrey Wang	559312000100	7584
25226	7590	06/01/2005	EXAMINER	
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 755 PAGE MILL RD PALO ALTO, CA 94304-1018			CHEU, CHANGHWA J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1641	
DATE MAILED: 06/01/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/687,174	Applicant(s) WANG ET AL.	
	Examiner Jacob Cheu	Art Unit 1641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/15/2005.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Handwritten signature/initials

Art Unit: 1641

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's amendment filed on 3/15/2005 has been received and entered into record and considered.

Claims 1-30 are pending under examination.

Deposit

It is noted that the specification on section 0236 indicates hybridomas 2.03, 2.04 and 2.11 are being prepared to deposit with the ATCC.

If the deposit have been made under the terms of the Budapest treaty, an affidavit or declaration by applicants or someone associated with the patent owner who is in a position to make such assurances, or a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature, stating that the **plasmid** has been deposited under the Budapest Treaty and that the **plasmid** will be irrevocably and without restriction or condition released to the public upon the issuance of a patent would satisfy the deposit requirement made herein. See 37 CFR 1.808. Further, the record must be clear that the deposit will be maintained in a public depository for a period of 30 years after the date of deposit or 5 years after the last request for a sample or for the enforceable life of the patent whichever is longer. See 37 CFR 1.806 1.808 (a)(2) and MPEP 2410-2410.01.

If the deposit has not been made under the Budapest treaty, then an affidavit or declaration by Applicants or someone associated with the patent owner who is in position to make such assurances, or statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature, stating that the deposit has been made at an acceptable depository and that the criteria set forth in 37 CFR 1.801-1.809, have been met

Art Unit: 1641

Amendment of the specification to disclose the date of the deposit and complete name and address of the depository is required

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

As set forth in *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988), enablement requires that the specification teach those skilled in the art to make and use the invention without undue experimentation. Factors to be considered in determining, whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation include 1) the nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the quantity of experimentation necessary, 7) the relative skill of those in the art, and 8) the breadth of the claims.

The current invention directs to a set of digital antibodies, wherein the set comprises at least 15 digital antibodies, wherein each antibody binds a different epitope, and wherein each digital antibody binds an epitope consisting of 3 or 4 consecutive amino acids, and wherein each antibody recognizes a plurality of proteins that comprise the epitope to which the antibody binds. Furthermore, the current invention also applies using the set of digital antibodies to generate protein binding profile, or using the binding profile in identifying bacteria, virus, or cells.

Art Unit: 1641

Applicant states that the instant invention is designed to “characterize, or fingerprint the protein sample” by use of the binding information (See Section 0053) Furthermore, applicant indicates that the current invention may be used to “generate a protein binding profile of sufficient specificity such that samples may be characterized, uniquely identified (including identification of one or more components in a sample) and/or distinguished. Thus, specificity of results and information arising from antibody binding is conferred via the binding sets of digital antibodies to protein in a sample” (See section 0053).

However, according to Geysen et al. (J. Mol Recognition 1988, Vol. 1, page 32), amino acid replaceability for the epitopes of the antigen to bind antibody is a common problem for specificity. Geysen et al. indicate that aspartate for glutamine, serine for threonine, or methionine have high frequency of replaceabilities, whereas glycine, tyrosine have low replaceability (See Abstract; Figure 2). Geysen et al. also show that on average about 4-5 amino acid residues in epitopes are required to determine the specificity and provide binding energy (See Abstract). In light of the experiments and comments of Geysen et al, the current invention would suffer specificity of “identifying or fingerprinting” target sample by comparing the protein binding profile. Because applicant uses smaller epitopes, such as 3 consecutive amino acid as epitopes which would have more chances for replaceability compared to 4-5 amino acid residues as taught by Geysen et al. Furthermore, the replaceability of different amino acid residues would also cause problem for specificity in recognition of different protein. For instance, as mentioned before, if glycine is replace by aspartate, or serine for threoinine, then the overall binding profile or information of the target proteins cannot be differentiated or distinguished since one cannot ascertain aspartate from glcyine, or serine from threonine. Thus, one cannot use the binding information to derive and predict the “fingerprint” or “characteristics” of the tested sample.

In view of the aforementioned lack of predictability in the art, undue experimentation would be required to practice the claimed methods with a reasonable expectation of success, absent a specific and detailed description in the applicant’s specification of how to effectively practice the recited method and absent working examples.

Art Unit: 1641

Response to Applicant's Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4. No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacob Cheu whose telephone number is 571-272-0814. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on 571-272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jacob Cheu

Examiner

Art Unit 1641

May 25, 2005



LONG V. LE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

05/27/05